DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 627 HE 005 742

TITLE	Evaluation of the Freshman Hours Program at UW-SP (University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point).
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Stevens Point. Office of Institutional Research.
REPORT NO	R-44
PUB DATE	May 73
NOTE	54p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Academic Probation; *College Freshmen; *Discipline Policy; *Higher Education; Probationary Period; Student Opinion
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Wisconsin Steven Point

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the academic performance of one entering class of probation freshmen for three semesters at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. All probation freshmen were subject to evening hour restrictions. Emphasis is also placed on the opinions of freshman students who have been on probation and directors of the fourteen residence halls concerning the hours regulations. Directors of the residence halls seemed to feel that the hours' program did not modify study habits of the students. Poor motivation, poor study skills, and weak college backgrounds were the most frequent cause of academic probation. (MJM)

PORT NO: 44
Y FILE WORD:
LE LETTER:
LE SEQUENCE:
TE: May, 1973

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Probation Freshmen
Academic Performance
Opinions

Residence Hall Directors
Opinions

EVALUATION OF THE FRESHMAN HOURS PROGRAM AT UW-SP

ED 094627

HE 005742

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

E MAIN BUILDING
NIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
TEVENS POINT 54481
ILLIAM H. CLEMENTS, DIRECTOR

Purpose

Less than three years ago the student hours regulations at UW-Stevens Point were revised upon request from the faculty student affairs committee. Prior to that time, hours regulations were in effect for women students only. The Chancellor abolished hours for all students except freshmen on academic probation. Thus, fewer students are now subject to hours regulations, but freshmen men and women both are subject to the evening hour restrictions if they are on academic probation.

A brief evaluation of the new hours regulations was conducted and submitted to the Chancellor in December, 1971. The present report includes a summary of the academic performance of one entering class of probation freshmen for three semesters. This second study is made to determine how well the hours program is working after a period of nearly three years.

The report deals with opinions of freshman students who have been on probation, with directors of the fourteen residence halls, and with the report on academic performance of probation freshmen. Some comparisons are made with the performance of 1969 freshman entrants who were placed on probation after one semester.

Opinions of Probation Freshmen

An attempt was made to secure the names of all probation freshmen living in residence halls during the first semester, 1972-73. It was found that not all of the probation students whose names were submitted were freshmen, and as a result, some non-freshman responses were received. Since these responses represent a different point of view, they are included, but separate from freshman responses. A copy of the brief questionnaire used is appended to this report. Since fewer than 100 freshmen responded, the data are somewhat limited. They represent about 39% of the freshman probation students this year.

The first question asked is "In general, did you obey the regulations?" Table 1, which follows, shows that about 65% of the respondents answered yes to this question. Only two residence halls showed a majority of negative responses.

Some of the yes responses were qualified by such comments as these:

"Most of the time I am in by 11:00 anyway."
"If I didn't have any work to do, I would go out."
"I had no place to go, since I did not turn 18 until mid December, and therefore I could not go into any bars."
"Maybe just violated it a few times."

TABLE 1

SUMMARY BY RESIDENCE HALL OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "IN GENERAL, DID YOU OBEY THE REGULATIONS?"

Residence Hall Number	Response Yes	Response No
1	3	1
2	7	3
3	9	5
4	6	1
5	3	0
6	3	2
7	2	6
8	3	1
9	1	3
10	5	2
11	3	1
12	2	2
13	5	0
14	4	3
TOTALS:	56	30

While some students "usually" followed directions, others reported that the hours were closely enforced. Note these comments:

"Yes I did because I had to."

"I found it hard that whenever everybody else went out for a wing party .... I had to be in by curfew."

"Only because the RA breathes down my neck."

The concern about being singled out for hours was expressed by one student as follows:

"When you are sitting in your room with the door open at 8:00 p.m. and see your friends leaving for the night out, it's very depressing to think you'll be the only one on the wing, and very hard not to go with them."

The yes tallies should not be taken to mean that most students followed the hours regulations closely, but only generally. Note the following comments:

"I obeyed the rules when it was convenient to do so. However, if I felt that I wanted to stay out after 11:00 p.m. I would do so."
"I have had three different occasions of being out after 11:00 because I pledged a fraternity. But I followed the rules like any other rules on campus."
"If I didn't have any work to do, I would go out."

In summary of the comments with the yes response, most freshman probation respondents indicated that they followed the hours in general, but the comments make it doubtful that most of them followed the hours closely.

The no responses indicated disagreement and defiance, as shown in the following typical comments.

"I didn't agree with them."
"I felt these regulations could do nothing to better my grades."
"My RA didn't enforce the hours. She felt she wasn't supposed to be a mother to us."
"I feel that I am old enough to do studying on my own."
"Someone else always had a key to get in."
"Nobody took the slight effort to enforce these rules."
"The whole idea behind curfew is so stupid I just ignored it."
"I never knew the hours because nobody enforced them."
"My dorm director did not enforce it."
"What regulations?"
"It wasn't always necessary for me to stay out, but it was mostly for the purpose of defiance."
"I was under no regulations. Someone slipped up and no one except me knew I was on probation."

The second question asked students was: "What amount of studying did you do after 11:00 p.m.?" The responses were difficult to classify, ranging from "absolutely none" to "nearly all". The most common response was, in effect, very little studying except for test nights. (Meaning a test the next day)

One gets the impression that with probation freshmen, studying is centered strictly around tests, rather than being a continuous activity. There was a significant minority who preferred to study after 11:00 because then everyone else was either asleep or studying. A few comments indicated that the 11:00 to 12:00 period was a "study break" time when people had just got back from going out, and a great deal of visiting was going on. There appeared to be no great dividing line as to late study between yes and no respondents concerning obedience to the hours regulations, with one exception. Some of the students who said they obeyed the regulations were very conscientious in their studies. No such conscientious students were detected among those who said they disregarded the hours.

A related question was, "How much studying did most students do after 11:00 p.m.?" The responses were again varied, but a frequent comment was that it depended on the student. Some studied much and others little. There was a tendency for respondents to give the same response for themselves and for others. Some said they didn't really know what others did - specifically some who said they did not observe the regulations. The majority of respondents saw other students as studying late about the same as they themselves did.

The next question, an important one, reads: "Was there any change in your study habits as a result of the freshman hours regulations?" Table 2 summarizes the responses, relating them to whether or not the student had observed the hours regulations. Only 19 students said the regulations had produced change in their study habits, while 62 said they had not and five gave indefinite or qualifying answers. Several of the no respondents said their study habits had changed, but not because of the hours regulations. Significantly, 18 of the 19 who said the hours regulations had changed their study habits said that they had observed the hours.

TABLE 2
CHANGE IN STUDY HABITS RELATED TO OBSERVATION
OF HOURS REGULATIONS

Did Study Habits Change Because Of Hours?	Did You Observe Hours?		
	Yes	No	Totals
Yes	18	1	19
No	36	26	62
No Response or Indefinite	2	3	5
TOTALS	56	30	86

It was a different matter where social life is concerned. When change in social habit is related to observance of hours regulations, as shown in Table 3, the yeses and noes come out different. Some 30 respondents indicated a change in social habits, while 51 did not. Of the 30 who said yes, 28 indicated that they had observed freshman hours. Among those who said their social habits had not changed, about half indicated that they had observed the hours. As might be expected, change in social habits was linked closely to whether or not the hours were observed.

As for the kinds of change in social habits, these are explained in the following comments.

"I didn't go out so much."
"When I did go some place, a concert, a play, etc., I always had to leave early."
"It totally disrupted them (habits) as I had several things that were sponsored by the university that I couldn't attend."
"The only time I went out drinking was on the weekend when there were no hours."
"Because if you wanted to get out of the dorm, you'd have to get out and back by 11:00. What a hassle!"
"Most people wouldn't go out with me because I had to be in early."
"It affected my social life drastically. I didn't have any. I lost touch with people other than those in my classes and dorm. I was

'forced' to leave for a majority of the weekends because I really didn't know my wing any more. I emphasized social life because I had such a fantastic one in high school.

"Less chasing all over the landscape. I found I went out and felt very guilty once out and wished I had done that work I left behind!"

"I didn't stay out as late as I did first semester."

In summary, it appears that although quite a few students' social life was altered, not all of them were happy about it.

TABLE 3

CHANGE IN SOCIAL LIFE RELATED TO OBSERVATION OF HOURS REGULATIONS

Did Social Habits Change Because Of Hours?	Did You Observe Hours?		
	Yes	No	Totals
Yes	28	2	30
No	26	25	51
No Response, or Indefinite	2	3	5
TOTALS	56	30	86

In answer to the question, "Do you understand the rationale of the program?" most students (60 out of 86) said yes. There were 21 no replies and 5 that were less definite. At least half of the no responses were accompanied by comments which indicated that students did understand the rationale but did not accept it. Here are a few accompanying comments. The replies were so numerous and at such great length that reproduction of them would be voluminous.

"I think the idea is if you can keep the students in the dorm more they'll study more and the punishment itself will be a reminder that they can flunk out."

"I know why such a program was devised, but I don't think its effectiveness is worth the effort. There are too many ways of getting around it. No one would study after a night out (though not that late) anyway so the rules are not ensuring studying."

"No, I'm not sure I understand. I tried questioning my dorm director but she couldn't tell me much."

"Yes. I don't like it. The people I know on probation never abide by the rules."

"Yes, the rationale of this program itself shows how senseless it is."

"No I don't. These are my reasons: 1. No one is going to study after coming in from a bar. 2. It hinders your life style with your own wing. 3. You can develop a wrong attitude toward your RA. 4. I came to this school on pro and it hurt my own self because I didn't get to know people the way I like to. 5. It classifies you as a 'dummy'."

"I understand the rationale, but to me and many others it is a very irresponsible move on the part of the university to force such a program on students."

"Yes. It was to show the university had power to slap my hand if I disobeyed the hours, but they really didn't. I felt they had a good idea but were going about it in a childish basis in that instead of dealing with little kids they were dealing with adults that if they wanted to could change their own way."

"No. I understand my dorm director was going to have a talk with me even though he wasn't going to enforce hours. But we never did. I got more from talking to my RA. She helped a lot. I'm glad she was there, and yet I hear that this campus might not have RA's any more. That's a mistake. I don't think that will raise enrollment."

"Yes. I can see that some people think they are doing you a favor by making you stay in to study while actually all they have done is change the location of your screwing off."

"Yes. It is good thinking. Not well enforced, however."

"Yes, I do. I think it will help my grades this semester."

When asked, "Do you accept the rationale of the program, 23 respondents answered definitely yes, while 52 answered no, and 11 either did not respond or gave less definite answers. Here are a few of many comments.

"No, because 18-19 year old people need not be told when to come and go, and if their studies suffer, they need help other than the hours program."

"Yes. Only because it isn't worth the hassle one receives if you don't follow it."

"Yes, but there are better ways. My brother told me about 'low slips' that were handed out in mid-semester to those with low grades at that point. This is better (although I'm sure it costs plenty) because the recipient is forced to face the real issue before permanent damage is done. The cost would be justified by possibly helping a few more kids in school."

"No. We're adults. We have minds of our own."

"Yes, if a person wants to study and settle down they're going to. I feel by not <u>enforcing</u> hours upon us they consented to the idea that either way a person who is here for a ride is still going to manipulate around the regulations or those who are ready to settle down, will. For me, pro sorta shook me up and offered two alternatives: IN or OUT."

"At first I didn't because I resented having someone, other than the people who raised me, tell me I can't do this and I can't do that. But I suppose if one doesn't have responsibility, someone must help him gain it, no matter what age."

"No. I'm paying to go here and if I don't care about what grade I'm getting, you shouldn't either."

"Yes, but as I said before it didn't really affect me. My grades were not poor because of social life. I had to accustom myself to the surroundings and gain confidence in myself knowing I can really do it if I want."

"No. Because there are many occasions on which say your wing has a party but you cannot come because you will not be back on time. Therefore we are becoming hermits as a result."

"No. It is just ridiculous to say students will do better if they have hours. I never had hours at home. Why should I have them now as a 'mature adult'?"

"Yes. I do because I need a little push."

Here the yes and no responses seem to be divided between those who are growing up and see the need of some constraint, and the no responses of the "mature adults" whose replies sound like those of children. The emotional NO responses are found to be in great majority.

The final question was: "Do you recommend that the freshman hours program be continued? Yes _____ No _____ (Please comment)" These lengthy responses have to be read individually to be fully appreciated.

Fourteen respondents recommended that the hours program be continued while 62 said it should not. The other ten were not sure. Some said the hours program should be good but was not working, either because of inadequate enforcement or because students did not react to it properly. Here are a few comments of different types.

"No. Most kids take advantage anyway and don't stay in. Some RA's are lenient."

"I think it would be much better if a student who is doing poorly in his studies would be required to attend a study and reading skills program sponsored by the university."

"I don't know. Though I know hours have not helped me, it could help someone else possibly."

"No. You can not force people to study. Also, every RA in my dorm knows that I am on pro, and that is really my business and no one else's."

"The program antagonizes those who are affected by it. I screwed off for a semester and now I am paying for it, but the program seems like prescribing aspirin for a cancer victim. Why not force the student to face reality before it's too late? If a student is doing marginal work, he often fools himself into believing he is getting better grades than he actually is."

"No. The hours program killed me as far as school went. I'm not returning next year because I don't accept the discipline. The only reason I did go along with the whole thing is because it was in my contract. The program could be a factor that incoming freshmen look at and it could discourage them."

"Here's my chance to say what I've always wanted to say about students getting stuck on freshman hours. I feel that freshman students are basically 'freed' senior high school students. That typically the first year you are on your own you tend to go 'hog wild' about parties, bars, boys, etc. I feel this is only natural. But somewhere between 2nd semester freshman and 1st semester sophomore, you become more responsible, go to bed earlier, get up earlier, study more, handle more, get involved in more activities besides getting drunk all the time. I honestly feel that hours only hinder this growing process of responsibleness. You don't learn it on your own, you're dictated all

over again. I feel that this program at one time may have benefited the student but it doesn't any more."

"Yes. However what good are they if it is not enforced?"

"Yes. I think the freshman year in college is more difficult than any of the others because the high school graduate is till adjusting to the life of leaving home. Some may be living away from home for the first time (like in my case). The study skills for academic courses are much more demanding than in high school. So freshman students are still trying to adjust. I think freshman hours should continue as an indication to new students to buckle down to hard work in order to make it. It is all up to the freshman student to either make it or break the chance of getting an education."

"Yes. It makes people think that maybe they aren't as good as they thought themselves to be."

In summary, most respondents are negative to student hours. What most of them seem to be saying is "Look, we're adults. You can't make us study by hours regulations. They only tend to embarrass us." Comparatively fewer students see the regulations in the light that they are intended.

Views of Residence Hall Directors

A brief questionnaire was sent to each of the fourteen residence hall directors in order to get their points of view concerning the operation of the freshman hours program. A copy of this form is appended to this report. Whereas the students were asked to remain anonymous, the hall directors were identified in their responses. For this reason the responses of hall directors are given in some detail so that their confidential replies need not be reviewed by someone outside this office. The student responses are too voluminous to be reproduced, but they may be made available to interested persons, since they are anonymous.

All fourteen residence hall directors responded, but one did not answer specific questions. Instead, this explanatory note was attached:

"First of all, I'm sorry this report is late. With all the end of the year confusion it must have slipped my mind. I'm sorry to say we did not enforce freshman hours. I am a new director this year, and the study was never explained to me. I was not even aware that the hours were part of a study until midway through the semester, and then it was too late. The idea of such a study is very good, and I can see a great need for such. I am just sorry I could not contribute more to such an effort."

Responses of the other thirteen directors are summarized question by question. The first question was, "Were the hours obeyed? Please comment." The replies follow.

"To my knowledge, but often there was no way of knowing."

"I feel that the hours were obeyed a great deal of the time. I had instructed my staff to keep watch to see if the probationary students were obeying the policy. However, due to numerous ways these students could come and go from the hall after 11:00 p.m., I cannot say the hours program was 100% successful."

"On the average, yes. Isolated incidents of violation of hours regulations were generally resented although obeyed."

"Each freshman in this hall who was on academic probation was informed of the necessity of compliance with the hours restriction. It was left to the individual to follow the restricted hours. If a staff member was aware of an infraction of the policy, the student was confronted. To my knowledge the regulations were obeyed."

"No - students have found numerous ways to sneak out of the hall, and it has been difficult to enforce the regulation. For those who obeyed the hours, there was no significant time devoted to academics."

"Some of the students obeyed it. Others felt it was a farce."

"Generally yes."

"For the most part the rules were obeyed. In dealing with the students, I don't feel the students respected or accepted the rationale."

"In most cases the regulations were obeyed, but not for the sake of the regulations. The students were just in the building because there was nothing else to do. There was some problem getting the support of the housing office for enforcement of hours. (Lack of willingness to see the violators)

"In most cases the hours regulation was not obeyed! Very few took the hour program very serious. About a fourth used it to their advantage."

"It's hard to tell as this regulation is as hard to enforce as it is unpopular. For those who wanted to get around the regulation, it was not difficult."

"We feel the people who came in under pro kept the regulations, but the freshmen who went on pro at the semester did not follow the rules on a regular basis."

"By and large, I think most students in this hall obeyed the regulations most of the time. Although we did try to enforce the regulation, we did not conduct a nightly 'bed check' so I imagine that a few students on a few occasions might have got away with a violation."

The second question reads: "In your opinion did the probation students do much studying after 11:00 p.m.? What about other students." Here are the replies:

"I believe very few students, on probation or not, studied after 11:00 p.m. on a regular basis."

"It is the general feeling of the staff that both pro students and other students studied quite often after 11:00 p.m."

"Not unless there was a test or paper due the following day. Same for other students."

"They did if they had exams or papers. Regarding the other students, the study habits were better this year than last. In general, most students on the average do not study after eleven."

"The studying that was done was not because they had to be in the hall after hours. Most students study for tests and not in a regular program of organized nightly study."

"No, most students on pro concentrated their social life until 11:00 every night because they were so aware of the restriction. Other students seemed to be able to take better control of a balance between academics and social life because they weren't reaching to an outside force. There were of course exceptions."

"On the whole not much more than they would be without hours."

"The nights that they were not forced in, they probably studied, but when they had to come back early from a date or something, I doubt that they studied."

"We found that the probation student had considerable difficulty establishing good study habits. What studying they did do, was not significant in terms of before or after 11:00 p.m. I don't feel there is anything significant about the 11:00 p.m. for other students; due to their study habits and self discipline they are able to regulate well their study time and social time."

"I can not be very specific - some students study after 11:00 p.m.; others don't. I think it depends on a number of factors: time of morning classes, up-coming tests, other activities occurring that day or group of days, ability to budget time during the day, etc. I do not think that all probation students study after 11:00 p.m. Students on probation, who wish to continue in the university, are aware that they need to evaluate their attitude, study habits, etc. -- more so than their use of hours after 11:00 p.m."

"No, they did not do much studying then. Most students don't study after 11:00 p.m. unless they are 'cramming' for an exam or have a paper or project due."

"Probation students studied if it was a requirement for the course or for a test. In relation to other students just as with probation students if there was an assignment to complete or a test then they studied but 11:00 p.m. had little to do with studying."

"No -- most students do not study that late unless they have a test or a paper due the next day; there are exceptions."

The third question was worded: "Do you think the students accept and understand the rationale of the program?" Here are the responses:

"No -- the students that I talked to who were on probation could not accept the rationale."

"I assumed that students understand the rationale because I felt that I explained it thoroughly to my staff and students who questioned me about it. When talking with probation students I feel that they did not accept the rationale fully."

"They find it very difficult to accept and understand the program."

"Few if any freshmen know the rationale behind the regulation. The rationale is not listed in the catalog. If they are given any information which might be interpreted as rationale - this comes from the resident assistant or hall director."

"They do not understand or accept the rationale of the program, due to their lack of initiative to study. I feel the encouragement they have received from our staff did more for their improvement than the 11:00 p.m. regulation of hours."

"In talking to many of the students, they do not accept the rationale of the program. They understand it, but will never accept it."

"No, and neither do I."

"I see students as understanding but not accepting. I made an effort to inform each staff person and pro student of the rationale. I focused heavily on the taxpayers' investment in each student's education, and the responsibility the university has to assume accountability. I suggested other ways the university could meet the problem, i.e. (1) immediate suspension once the student has indicated incapability regardless of reasons (2) required tutoring (3) required study schedules, programs (4) asking students on pro to make up financial compensation that the state now pays."

"I think that students understand the rationale for the program, but they do not accept it or believe in it. The students who do follow the regulations would probably be in studying even if there were no regulations."

"In our hall we meet with each student and explain the rationale -- it is their responsibility to do something about changing. We check with each student about once a month to see how they are doing, but the RA has more frequent contact."

"No!"

"The students seem to understand but no way they accept it."

"Although we (the RA's, AD and I) tried to initially explain the rationale to the students (and as necessary throughout the year), I feel that students accepted the fact of the rationale while rejecting its validity (vehemently rejecting it)."

The fourth question has already been answered by most directors, as quoted previously. It reads: "Do you think there was any change in study habits as a result of the program?" All directors answered in the negative, some saying "absolutely none". Only two responses are quoted:

"In general no. Most students on hours probation first semester were not on probation 2nd semester (just to avoid penalty/restrictions of hours), but this motivation did not exist the 2nd semester for obvious reasons. Those who were capable and interested studied or sought help; those who weren't didn't."

"About one-third change or adopt new habits."

The fifth question asked: "Were there any formalized study programs available and were they utilized?" Following are the responses:

"We asked Bob Mosier to run a study skills group. The first class was attended by about 30 students. The second class no one showed. We had a file of past tests, notes, etc. of classes taught in previous semesters."

"Last year we had Dr. Mosier .... This year my individual staff members were instructed to pay special attention to these students and encourage them to participate in study skills programs at the Counseling Center."

"They were available. They were utilized by a very few -- most were not on probation."

"Several wings in the hall had someone from the counseling center in to discuss study habits with them. I talked with several people concerning their priorities and use of time."

"Through the counseling center and with staff here we attempted groups and study skills seminars. They were attended for the initial meeting but attendance has fallen off to where the groups no longer meet, and the people referred to the counseling center no longer attend."

"During the last two years we have held study skills sessions. The attendance is high during the first two weeks of each semester. We have requested those on probation to take part. Some have, and some figure it to be a waste of time."

"Yes, by those who needed them."

"Study skills groups - limited use; counseling - related to future goals - each was approached in a comfortable way."

"We encourage our students to make use of the study skills program at the counseling center. We have an informal upperclass tutor program in the hall and it does get a lot of use."

"Yes! - in most cases - no. Study skills programs and reading programs plus a writing lab were available."

"Yes. My RA's met with all students on probation on their wings and helped them organize study hours, improve study methods, etc. This proved much more effective than trying to get them in at 11:00 p.m."

"Yes, we had study skills programs, tips for taking exams, as well as encouraging people to use programs outside the hall (reading, writing, and study labs). Many of the probation students attended."

In summary, it appears that all of the halls were providing special programs and encouraging probation students to use them.

The sixth question reads: "Was there any discernible change as a result of the program?" The question, located where it was, proved ambiguous. Hall directors who thought "the program" referred to study skills, counseling, etc. thought the results were favorable. Those who thought reference was to the freshman hours program were negative. Some thought freshman hours produced hostility in students. Said one director, "For many students it's the realization

that they are in control of their success or failure. They find that they need to look at their behavior and attitudes, many of which are self-defeating."

The seventh question was inserted in order to try to determine what kinds of backgrounds and habits lead to probation status. It was worded: "In your observation, to what extent are the probation students people with personality problems, weak college backgrounds, or poor study skills?" Here are the comments:

"It seems that it is impossible to categorize probation students. I think that some have a combination of these problems; others are affected by only one factor; others are just here for a good time; others because their parents want them to be here and they don't, so they are biding time, and there are probably other reasons."

"In my opinion the probationary students have a combination of poor study skills and a certain lack of motivation because they did not know for certain if college was for them."

"Usually poor study skills is the greatest reason - or - little desire or motivation to be in school. Some have weak college backgrounds - especially in reading skills and writing (expression of ideas, spelling, grammar) ability. Personality problems seem to be in the area of 'Who am I? What am I doing here?' questions that every freshman seems to be asking."

"I view academic probation as one of many indications that a person has some maturing, self-disciplining and examining of priorities to do. I do not necessarily see them as personality problems. It (probation) is also an indication that many people are here without having actively made the decision to work, because many cannot visualize what they are working towards. Lack of initiative, understanding one's own potential, etc. are the problems behind academic pro."

"It is difficult to separate the three. I do feel that individual students might exhibit one or all three of the characteristics responsible for this poor academic performance. Of the three characteristics mentioned the weak background and poor study skills are predominant. There have been cases where personality problems have played a key role in the student's total adjustment and hence his poor academic performance. I feel by and large the latter two characteristics are most common with students on probation."

"Very few students on probation had personality problems. Many had weak college backgrounds, and coming in at 11:00 p.m. made it worse in some cases. Instead of studying, they would goof off. Many of them had poor study skills and would not take advantage of the programs we offered."

"All of the above contribute in most cases, but motivation and direction are two major areas that contribute significantly."

"I would estimate about 50% but I do not see them as going hand in hand by any means."

"I believe that the great majority of the probation students lack academic motivation. They are here to have a good time or because they were forced to come to school by their parents. Occasionally some students really mature and work to the best of their ability and do very well."

"I would say that most have weak college preparation and poor study skills. Most feel they have to go with the crowd; if they (the crowd) go out, the probation student has to go along."

"I don't feel I can accurately comment to the extent of these problems, but I feel all probation students exhibit one or all three of these traits to a greater or lesser degree."

"Generally we believe that one of the great problems is using their time efficiently. There seems to be very little correlation with any personality problems. Weak backgrounds probably takes its toll on poor GPR's, but the weak background could also be due to poor use of time."

"The major factor, it seems to me, that is common to most hours probation students is a lack of motivation or understanding for why they are here in college. (Sometimes combined with a lack of academic skills) Other students have demonstrated that a strong motivation to succeed in college frequently makes up for other weaknesses."

A review of these comments brings out the conviction that several factors are thought to contribute to academic probation. The weight of opinion places lack of motivation at the head of the list, with poor study skills or poor college preparation second. Personality problems are not considered to be frequent contributers to academic probation.

The hall directors were invited to make further comments beyond answering specific questions, and a few of them did so. Here are two comments.

"We feel that this program is not the answer. We can lead them to water, but..... can we talk about courses on study skills, possibly mandatory - for credit - for people on pro. Let's talk about rationing their time voluntarily. This last semester I started a program called Grade Points Anonymous. The thrust was for people on each floor on probation to help each other use their time more wisely. We talked about if they were really sincere in their desire to go to school. We have heard some good comments about this. We definitely need some structured programs for these people, but we really can't see chasing them down, forcing them in, and setting them down as anything resembling a program."

"Although I have enforced and tried to support the hours probation program over the past three years (and have handled my share of discipline in this area), I do not feel that the program should be continued. Students have found it extremely difficult (if not impossible) to understand how hours restrictions have any effect on their grades -- they justifiably point out that being in at 11:00 p.m. does not mean that they study, go to bed, or anything else; the extent of their studying time is determined by their motivation and the immediate requirements of their classes, not the hour by which they are in the hall. As most students see the hours restrictions as punitive rather than helpful, it is additionally difficult to help them objectively see their difficulties and then work them out. (That is, the hours restrictions program has become another hurdle we must cross before we are able to help the student help himself.) Thus, I strongly recommend that the hours probation program not be continued beyond this 3-year trial period; in my hall, it has been beneficial neither to the students nor to the staff."

Academic Performance

The housing office provided a list of 147 new freshmen admitted on probation for the fall of 1971. Only 105 of these students entered school then, and 42 did not enter. Of the 105, 70 were living in residence halls while 35 were not, according to data obtained from the records. The academic performance of these two groups is shown in the following table. Here we may see that of the 70 residence hall students, 24 had been suspended and two had withdrawn while doing failing work. Twenty were still on probation, and six who had "squeaked by" the first year did not enroll the following fall. This left 16 students still in school and in the clear after three semesters. A few of these students had done very good work. Almost every one of these successful students had done C or better work during the first semester they were in school. For all students, typically the second semester performance was not as good. No successful student had a GPR lower than 1.44 the first semester.

Part B of the table shows academic performance of 35 first semester freshmen who entered on probation, and who were not listed as living in residence halls. Seventeen of these had been suspended, 8 were on probation, and three had survived as far as they went but were not in school a third semester. Two withdrew without record during their first semester. This left five students still in school and "in the clear". Only one of these students had a GPR the first semester below 2.00, and that student's average was 1.50.

In summary, 21 students (or 21%) were in the clear and not on probation at the end of three semesters. Ten more students on probation were still in school at the end of three semesters. One student had been suspended after a semester, was readmitted, and did satisfactory work the third semester. The fate of other suspended students is not known at this point.

TABLE 4

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND STATUS OF FRESHMEN ENTERING ON PROBATION

FALL OF 1971

A: RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS

Student Number	H. S. %-ile Rank	Academic Status	Grade Point Ratio by Term				
			SS '71	1971-72 Sem. I	1971-72 Sem. II	SS '72	1972-73 Sem. I
1	7	Prob.		1.60	1.69		
2	21			2.07	2.00		
3	9	Sus.		0.00			
4	16	Sus.		1.53	1.53		
5	8	o.k.		1.67	2.40		2.53
6	20	Prob.		0.93			
7	-	Prob.	2.00	1.27			
8	7	Sus.		1.20	1.79		
9	6	Sus.		0.69			
10	18	Prob.		0.33	Sus.		2.67
11	-	Sus.	0.00				
12	19	o.k.		2.00	2.06		2.43
13	24			2.00	W		
14	15	Sus.		0.54			
15	10	o.k.		1.44	2.43		2.80
16	10	Sus.		0.21			
17	19	Sus.		0.64			
18	12	Sus.		1.00	0.00		
19	15	Sus.		0.00			
20	14	Prob.		2.07	1.33		
21	9	o.k.		1.63	2.00		2.50
22	20	Prob.	1.50	1.85	1.31		
23	19	Sus.		0.60			
24	17	Prob.		0.87			
25	15	Prob.		1.79	1.00		
26	21	o.k.		2.00	2.23		
27	4	o.k.		2.07	2.00		
28	2	W					
29	8	Prob.		1.00	2.06		2.08
30	19	Sus.		0.73			
31	12	o.k.		3.40	3.21		3.40

TABLE 4 - A: RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS - Continued

Student Number	H. S. %-ile Rank	Academic Status	Grade Point Ratio by Term				
			SS '71	1971-72 Sem. I	1971-72 Sem. II	SS '72	1972-73 Sem. I
32	8	Prob.		1.33	1.30	3.00	1.86
33	3	Sus.		0.08			
34	10	Sus.		2.00	1.18		0.92
35	24	o.k.		2.31	2.75		
36	24	Sus.		1.27	2.00		
37	17	Sus.		0.40			
38	22	Prob.		1.00	1.93		2.25
39	23	o.k.		2.00	2.38		2.33
40	15	o.k.		2.64	2.58		2.50
41	14	Sus.		1.64	1.53		
42	2	o.k.		2.40	3.21		2.44
43	15	o.k.		2.38	2.27		2.00
44	23	Prob.		1.54	2.23		1.93
45	24	o.k.		2.76	3.60		3.00
46	16	Prob.		2.75	1.53		1.54
47	14	Prob.		1.29	2.75		1.21
48	24	o.k.		2.50	3.40		2.60
49	20	o.k.		2.57			
50	13	Sus.		1.78	1.00		
51	23	Sus.		0.50			
52	22	Sus-Readmit.		1.79	0.33		
53	13	Sus.		1.13	1.27		
54	16	o.k.		2.67	2.53		2.21
55	24	o.k.		2.67	1.64		1.73
56	20	o.k.	2.00	1.93	1.40		3.07
57	21	W					
58	9	Sus.		1.40	1.67		
59	21	Prob.		1.80	1.69		1.93
60	12	o.k.		2.13	W		
61	1	Prob.		1.13	1.80		2.19
62	11	Prob.	2.00	1.27			
63	22	Sus.		1.92	W		0.55
64	15	Prob.		2.00	1.09		
65	6	o.k.		3.18	2.87		3.00

TABLE 4 - A: RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS - Continued

Student Number	H. S. %-ile Rank	Academic Status	Grade Point Ratio by Term				
			SS '71	1971-72 Sem. I	1971-72 Sem. II	SS '72	1972-73 Sem. I
66	22	Sus.		1.79	0.33		
67	12	Prob.		2.00	1.47		1.79
68	-	Prob.		2.50	1.58		2.00
69	18	o.k.		2.82	2.15		2.82
70	18	o.k.		2.00	2.33		

Mean High School Rank: 15.12

TABLE 4

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND STATUS OF FRESHMEN ENTERING ON PROBATION

FALL OF 1971

B: OFF CAMPUS STUDENTS

Student Number	H. S. %-ile Rank	Academic Status	Grade Point Ratio by Term				
			SS '71	1971-72 Sem. I	1971-72 Sem. II	SS '72	1972-73 Sem. I
1	14	Sus.	2.50	1.15	0.33		
2	9	o.k.		1.50	2.47		2.25
3	19	Prob.		2.10	1.13		2.00
4	16	Sus.		0.18			
5	18	Sus.	2.00	1.00	0.00		
6	12	Prob.		1.79	1.69		1.86
7	3	Prob.		2.00	1.15		
8	-	Prob.		1.60	1.88		1.80
9	10	Sus.		0.00			
10	22	Sus.		1.21	2.20		1.45
11	19	Prob.		1.83	1.80		1.69
12	22	Sus.		0.40			
13	21	Sus.		1.00	0.00		
14	13	o.k.		2.42	2.08		1.67
15	10	Sus.		1.71	0.00		
16	8	Sus.	1.50	1.25	1.14		
17	9	o.k.		2.00			
18	16	Sus.		0.00	1.77		
19	13	Prob.	2.50		1.20	4.00	1.45
20	20	o.k.		2.27			2.75
21	23	Sus.	2.00	0.33			
22	8	Sus.	2.00	0.92	0.33		
23	6	Sus.		0.44			
24	24	Prob.		1.67	1.85		2.33
25	21	Sus.	2.50	1.13	1.75		
26	19	Sus.	2.00	0.00			
27	6	o.k.	2.00	2.25	1.86		
28	22	o.k. so far		1.80			

TABLE 4 - B: OFF CAMPUS STUDENTS - Continued

Student Number	H. S. %-ile Rank	Academic Status	Grade Point Ratio by Term				
			SS '71	1971-72 Sem. I	1971-72 Sem. II	SS '72	1972-73 Sem. I
29	11	o.k.		2.00	2.25		2.47
30	11	Sus.		1.33	0.00		1.13
31	21	o.k.	2.50	2.75	3.00		2.29
32	20	Sus.		0.00			
33	15			W			
34	10	Prob.		1.60	2.17		1.42
35	21			W			

Mean High School Rank: 15.06

Summary and Conclusions

This evaluation of the freshman hours program is being conducted near the end of the third year of operation of the program. The questionnaires were issued in April and the report written in May, 1973. A tentative report had been made concerning the program in December, 1971, and submitted to the Chancellor.

This report covers opinions of probation freshman students of the 1972-73 school year who were in school toward the end of the second semester, plus the opinion of all fourteen residence hall directors. It also provides a record of the academic performance for three semesters of 105 freshman students who entered on probation in the fall of 1971. Copies of the questionnaires used are appended.

Nearly two-thirds of the 86 responding students indicated that "in general" they obeyed the regulations. Review of their comments leads one to believe that fewer than half obeyed the regulations strictly - probably not more than a third. Numerous students expressed contempt for the regulations, while some followed them religiously because their RA's "breathed down their necks". A few kept the hours on their own. About three-fourths of the respondents said their study habits did not change because of the hours, but they were students who had actually observed the hours. The students reported varying study habits. Some did no studying after 11:00 p.m. while others studied late a great deal. Most of them had the habit of studying late only because of tests and papers - in fact much of the study centered around tests.

More than half of the students who really observed the hours said their social life was changed. Almost none of those who did not observe hours said their social life was changed.

The great majority of respondents said they understood the rationale of the hours program. Comments of some who said they did not really indicated that they did not accept the rationale. Fewer than 30% of the respondents were willing to accept the rationale of the program, and many were violently opposed. Some responses indicate refusal to "face the music". When one says, "I'm paying to go here and if I don't care what grade I'm getting, you shouldn't either" it is evident that some students are not aware that the State is carrying nearly 80% of the cost. The frequent comments to the extent that "we're eighteen and adult; nobody can tell us what to do" seems to imply that no constraints whatever can be placed on them as "adults". A few students changed their minds and concluded before the year was over that hours regulations were a good thing. Some thought they should be better enforced. But in general the attitude was strongly negative. Fewer than 20% thought the hours should be continued.

Responses of the residence hall directors are too complex to submit to any concise summary; they need to be read verbatim to be appreciated. They were carefully written and thoughtful. The reference to "we" in some of them reveals that some hall directors discussed the questions with their staffs and came to agreement before replying. Some generalizations can be derived from the responses. The freshman hours program was enforced in different ways and to varying degrees. Compliance ranged from very little to quite general, in the opinion of the directors. One respondent observed that those who entered on probation kept the rules well, but those who got on probation the second semester complied very little.

Most directors did not think there was much studying done after 11:00 p.m. except on occasion of tests. There were exceptions. Consensus was that most students understood but did not accept the rationale of the hours program. Some directors took great pains to explain the rationale. One or two admitted

that they themselves could not accept the rationale. Nearly all directors concluded that the hours program did not modify study habits of students.

All of the residence hall directors used formalized study programs and sometimes other devices to improve probation students' study skills and habits. Help clinics were thought to be successful, but some studies classes tended to "peter out".

Responses of the hall directors tend to lead to the conclusion that poor motivation is the most frequent cause of probation status. Poor study skills and weak college backgrounds also are frequently observed among probation students. Personality problems were of minor importance in probation status.

The hall directors generally do not think that the freshman hours program is the solution to poor college scholarship. Some directors take the view that enforcement of the hours harms their relationships with the probation students. A few alternatives have been suggested, chiefly methods of working with students to improve their skills or attitudes.

A review of academic performance of probation students is most revealing. A three semester follow-up was made of the 147 freshman applicants who were admitted on probation for the fall of 1971. Only 105 actually registered, out of which 21 (or 20%) cleared probation by the end of three semesters. Most of the students did poorer, rather than better, work the second semester than the first. At the end of three semesters there were 20 students still in school but on probation. Six had "squeaked by" the first year but did not enroll here the following fall.

The mortality rate was higher for off campus probation freshmen than for those in residence halls, although the averaged high school ranks of the two groups were almost identical. Perhaps the most significant fact is that nearly every student who survived did well the first semester in school. Scarcely a student who had cleared probation earned a GPR of less than 2.00 the first semester. This dispells the myth that we can "save" college freshmen by putting

the probation GPR clear down to the 0.75-1.59 category. We may also note the tendency for freshmen entering on probation to do poorer work the second semester after they had cleared probation while those who did not quite get there more often continued to improve.

The investigator is inclined to make certain tentative recommendations on the basis of the evidence presented in this report. Freshmen who enter on probation should be warned that they will face difficulty in college. Apparently a few benefit from the hours regulations, while a good many merely resent them. What are the alternatives? One of the hall directors (P. 15) lists immediate suspension, required tutoring, required study schedules or programs, and paying the total cost of education. It might be feasible to give entering probation students a choice of two or more alternatives, including hours regulations.

As for freshmen who get on probation after one semester, they might be given some of these same alternatives. But it makes little sense to place the first semester GPR minimum at 0.75. The evidence indicates that this will not salvage any students. Low students are much more likely to make the grade if they are dropped for a semester or more and then return to school. This is in line with the findings of a previous study.# It would be more practical to place the minimum GPR for probation at 1.50 after one semester and 1.80 thereafter.

#See: William H. Clements, "Forced Withdrawal in the Schools of Applied Arts and Sciences, and Letters and Science, at WSU-Stevens Point: Its Relationship to Certain Characteristics of Recent Graduates" Office of Institutional Research, June, 1967.

Appendix A

AN EVALUATION OF THE FRESHMAN HOURS PROGRAM

The records show that you are one of the subjects of the freshman hours program, requiring certain hour observance for freshmen on academic probation. Please complete the following form and return to me by campus mail within a few days. You should not sign the form, but please be as frank and as detailed as you wish. Thank you for your help in this matter. Return completed form to: William H. Clements, Director of Institutional Research & Studies, 056 Main.

1. In general, did you obey the regulations? Yes _____ No _____ Please comment.

2. a. What amount of studying did you do after 11:00 p.m.?

b. How much studying did most students do after 11:00 p.m.?

3. Was there any change in your study habits as a result of the freshman hours regulations?

4. Was there any change in your social hibits because of the hours policy?

5. Do you understand the rationale of the program? (please comment)

6. Do you accept the rationale of the program? (please comment)

7. Do you recommend that the freshman hours program be continued? Yes _____
   No _____ (please comment)

Appendix B

DATE: April 20, 1973

TO: Directors of Residence Halls
UW-Stevens Point

FROM: William H. Clements, Director of Institutional Research & Studies

RE: Freshman Hours Program Research

The freshman hours program was revised less than three years ago to provide that only freshmen on probation had to observe hours. The Chancellor has requested a second review of the program, and I have contacted the Department of Housing concerning this study. I am asking you to facilitate this study by answering the following questions as forthrightly as you can. If you require more space, write on back of questionnaire or append a reply. Please complete as soon as convenient and return by campus mail to me at 056 Main. Thank you for your help.

1. Were the hour regulations obeyed? Please comment.

2. In your opinion did the probation students do much studying after 11 p.m.? What about other students?

3. Do you think the students accept and understand the rationale of the program?

4. Do you think there was any change in study habits as the result of the program?

5. Were there any formalized study programs available and were they utilized?

6. Was there any discernible change as a result of the program?

7. In your observation, to what extent are the probation students people with personality problems, weak college backgrounds, or poor study skills? Please comment.

If you have additional comments to add please foward these also to me. Your help is greatly appreciated.

WHC/kj

cc: Melvin J. Karg

ENROLLMENTS BY SELECTED YEARS: BY CLASS AND SEX; PER CENT DROPPED (ACADEMIC)

EVALUATION OF FRESHMAN HOURS PROGRAM

PART II: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT STATUS PRINTOUTS

WILLIAM H. CLEMENTS
DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
STEVENS POINT, WISCONSIN 54481

WILLIAM H. CLEMENTS, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH & STUDIES

May, 1973

Explanation of Tables

The first phase of this study appraised the opinions of probation freshman and residence hall directors, and then followed for three semesters the academic fortunes of one set of entering probation freshman. Part II consists largely of a set of tables showing the number of men and women enrolled in each class for each semester during the period 1967 to 1973, as well as the number of academic drops at the end of that semester. Drops are also recorded as per cent of enrollments.

In looking through the set of tables, it becomes clear that several factors influence the per cent of drops: possible differences in student quality from year to year, possible differences in grading standards (such as the introduction of pass-fail grading), and changes in the policies concerning what GPR constitutes academic suspension of probation status. It is known that the average GPR has risen rather steadily in the last four years. This also may have affected the percentage of academically suspended students

Reviewing all of the evidence presented in these tables, one must conclude that the year-by-year numbers and proportions of academic suspention are not reliable enough to make comparisons between periods. The chief reason for this decision is that data were obtained from printouts. These printouts do not distinguish between freshman (for instance) who have taken less than two semesters of work and others who may have taken two or more semesters of work but have fewer credits than necessary to become sophomores by present definition.

A more precise comparison between performances under the freshman hours era and before it can be made by following all entrants during selected semesters from the two periods.

ENROLLMENTS BY CLASS & SEX

1967-1968

Semester I

	MEN			WOMEN			TOTAL		
Class	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.
Freshman (1-2)	1,331	37	2.7	838	4	0.4	2,169	41	1.8
Sophomore (3-4)	895	2	0.2	614	0	0.0	1,509	2	0.1
Junior (5-6)	667	0	0.0	448	0	0.0	1,115	0	0.0
Senior (7-8)	503	2	0.3	364	0	0.0	867	2	0.2
TOTALS	3,396	41	1.2	2,264	4	0.1	5,660	45	0.7
Semester II									
Freshman (1-2)	1,280	266	20.7	773	123	15.9	2,053	389	18.9
Sophomore (3-4)	868	83	9.5	562	35	6.2	1,430	118	8.2
Junior (5-6)	680	42	6.1	452	19	4.2	1,132	61	5.3
Senior (7-8)	526	16	3.0	330	3	0.9	856	19	2.2
TOTALS	3,354	407	12.1	2,117	180	8.5	5,471	587	10.7
YEAR TOTALS	6,750	448	6.6	4,381	184	4.1	11,131	632	5.6

ENROLLMENTS BY CLASS & SEX

1968-1969

Semester I

	MEN			WOMEN			TOTAL		
Class	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.
Freshman (1-2)	1,888	151	7.9	1,377	38	2.7	3,265	189	5.7
Sophomore (3-4)	875	31	3.5	524	9	1.7	1,399	40	2.8
Junior (5-6)	660	11	1.6	435	3	0.6	1,095	14	1.2
Senior (7-8)	438	6	1.3	343	0	0.0	781	6	0.7
TOTALS	3,861	199	5.1	2,679	50	1.8	6,540	249	3.8
Semester II									
Freshman (1-2)	1,334	276	20.6	950	88	9.2	2,284	364	15.9
Sophomore (3-4)	916	102	11.1	606	26	4.2	1,522	128	8.4
Junior (5-6)	712	67	9.4	498	20	4.0	1,210	87	7.1
Senior (7-8)	649	20	3.0	409	5	1.2	1,058	25	2.3
TOTALS	3,611	465	12.8	2,463	139	5.6	6,074	604	9.9
YEAR TOTALS	7,472	664	8.8	5,142	189	3.6	12,614	853	6.7

ENROLLMENTS BY CLASS & SEX

1969-1970

Semester I

Class	MEN			WOMEN			TOTAL		
	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.
Freshman (1-2)	1,848	171	9.2	1,403	55	3.9	3,251	226	6.9
Sophomore (3-4)	1,015	87	8.5	756	25	3.3	1,771	112	6.3
Junior (5-6)	812	39	4.8	521	10	1.9	1,333	49	3.6
Senior (7-8)	708	11	1.5	491	0	0.0	1,199	11	0.9
TOTALS	4,383	308	7.0	3,171	90	2.8	7,554	398	5.2
Semester II									
Freshman (1-2)	1,528	153	10.0	1,117	31	2.7	2,645	184	6.9
Sophomore (3-4)	976	43	4.4	770	11	1.4	1,746	54	3.0
Junior (5-6)	787	25	3.1	537	6	1.1	1,324	31	2.3
Senior (7-8)	712	9	1.2	506	2	0.3	1,218	11	0.9
TOTALS	4,003	230	5.7	2,930	50	1.7	6,933	280	4.0
YEAR TOTALS	8,386	538	6.4	6,101	140	2.2	14,487	678	4.6

ENROLLMENTS BY CLASS & SEX

1970-1971

Semester I

	MEN			WOMEN			TOTAL		
Class	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.
Freshman (1-2)	1,880	207	11.0	1,303	59	4.5	3,183	266	8.3
Sophomore (3-4)	1,226	92	7.5	931	29	3.1	2,157	121	5.6
Junior (5-6)	889	44	4.5	697	7	1.0	1,586	51	3.2
Senior (7-8)	818	17	2.0	512	0	0.0	1,330	17	1.2
TOTALS	4,813	360	7.4	3,443	95	2.7	8,256	455	5.5
Semester II									
Freshman (1-2)	1,486	128	8.6	1,041	25	2.4	2,527	153	6.0
Sophomore (3-4)	1,127	107	9.4	858	35	4.0	1,985	142	7.1
Junior (5-6)	902	32	3.5	714	9	1.2	1,616	41	2.5
Senior (7-8)	826	17	2.0	552	5	0.9	1,378	22	1.5
TOTALS	4,341	284	6.5	3,165	74	2.3	7,506	358	4.7
YEAR TOTALS	9,154	644	7.0	6,608	169	2.5	15,762	813	5.1

ENROLLMENTS BY CLASS & SEX

1971-1972

Semester I

	MEN			WOMEN			TOTAL		
Class	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.
Freshman (1-2)	1,624	227	13.9	1,323	69	5.2	2,947	296	10.0
Sophomore (3-4)	975	78	8.0	734	19	2.5	1,709	97	5.7
Junior (5-6)	916	64	6.9	694	6	0.8	1,610	70	4.3
Senior (7-8)	850	14	1.6	701	1	0.1	1,551	15	1.0
TOTALS	4,365	383	8.7	3,452	95	2.7	7,817	478	6.1
Semester II									
Freshman (1-2)	1,365	128	9.3	1,053	45	4.2	2,418	173	7.1
Sophomore (3-4)	1,107	95	8.5	901	27	2.9	2,008	122	6.1
Junior (5-6)	1,031	39	3.7	769	14	1.8	1,800	53	2.9
Senior (7-8)	891	20	2.2	723	6	0.8	1,614	26	1.6
TOTALS	4,394	282	6.4	3,446	92	2.6	7,840	374	4.7
YEAR TOTALS	8,759	665	7.5	6,898	187	2.7	15,657	852	5.4

ENROLLMENT BY CLASS & SEX

1972-1973

Semester I

	MEN			WOMEN			TOTAL		
Class	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.	Students Enrolled	No. Drop.	% Drop.
Freshman (1-2)	1,556	147	9.4	1,238	56	4.5	2,794	203	7.2
Sophomore (3-4)	1,104	63	5.7	877	28	3.1	1,981	91	4.5
Junior (5-6)	964	55	5.7	744	11	1.4	1,708	66	3.8
Senior (7-8)	965	19	1.9	706	0	0.0	1,671	19	1.1
TOTALS	4,589	284	6.1	3,565	95	2.6	8,154	379	4.6
Semester II									
Freshman (1-2)	1,085	119	11.0	910	37	4.1	1,995	156	7.8
Sophomore (3-4)	989	65	6.6	836	37	4.4	1,825	102	5.6
Junior (5-6)	988	40	4.0	740	6	0.8	1,728	46	2.7
Senior (7-8)	1,027	16	1.6	710	3	0.4	1,737	19	1.1
TOTALS	4,089	240	5.9	3,196	83	2.6	7,285	323	4.4
YEAR TOTALS	8,678	524	6.0	6,761	178	2.6	15,439	702	4.5

EVALUATION OF THE FRESHMAN HOURS PROGRAM

PART III

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE UNDER HOURS VS. NO HOURS

WILLIAM H. CLEMENTS
DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
STEVENS POINT, WISCONSIN 54481

July 16, 1973

A final phase of the freshman hours evaluation consists in making a comparison of academic performance for two groups of entering freshmen: those who entered in 1967-70 when previous hours were in effect, and those who entered in 1970-73 since the present freshman hours program took effect. It is impractical, and even impossible, to cover the academic records of all students involved during the entire periods with which we are concerned, and to have the data summarized by the time a decision must be made concerning continuance of the freshman hours program. For this reason the study is reduced to two specific comparisons: (1) the academic performance for four semesters of freshmen entering on probation in the fall of 1968 when men were not restricted to hours restrictions, compared to the academic performance for four semesters of freshmen entering on probation in the fall of 1970 when they were all subject to hours restrictions at the outset. (2) The academic performance for four semesters of all freshman women who enter (not on probation) in 1968, compared to the academic performance for four semesters of all freshman women who entered (not on probation) in the fall of 1970. It should be noted that the 1968 women entrants were subject to previous hours regulations for four semesters, while the 1970 women entrants were not, unless they went on probation for the second semester of the freshman year.

Summaries for the first comparison are shown in accompanying Table 1. Here we see that 125 freshmen entered on probation in 1968 while 81 entered on probation in 1970. We may note that 63 of the 1968 entrants were suspended and had not returned, compared to 34 of the 1970 entrants. A higher percentage of the 1970 entrants were in school and in the clear after four semesters. Approximately the same proportion in each group had withdrawn from school while on probation.

In order to make proper comparison between the performances of the 1968 and 1970 probation entrants, Table 2 was prepared. In this table it is assumed that

students in the clear after four semesters, and students who withdrew while in the clear after two or more semesters are "successful" students. The latter group could have transferred to another school, whether or not they did. The "failures" are those who withdrew while having a GPR below 2.00, or those who withdrew on probation, or withdrew after one semester or before any credits were earned, or who were suspended and had not returned since suspension. The verdict is still out for those still in school but on probation after four semesters. When the success and failure categories for the two groups are compared, it is found that 21.6% of the 1968 entrants were successful, compared to 30.9% of the 1970 entrants. The failures made up 69.6% of the 1968 distribution but only 60.5% of the 1970 distribution. The percentages who were still in school but on probation after four semesters were almost identical. It appears that the 1970 probation entrants, who were subject to hours regulations, had some academic advantage. When the numbers in these categories are submitted to the chi-squared test, it is possible to attribute the differences in proportions to chance sampling.

TABLE 1

STATUS AFTER FOUR SEMESTERS OF FRESHMEN ENTERING ON PROBATION: SELECTED YEARS

Status	Entered 1968 No.	Entered 1968 Per Cent	Entered 1970 No.	Entered 1970 Per Cent
A. In the clear and in school at end of four semesters	24	19.2	19	23.5
B. In school, on probation at end of four semesters	11	8.8	7	8.6
C. Withdrew in clear after two or more semesters				
(1) GPR 2.00 or better	3	2.4	6	7.4
(2) GPR below 2.00	6	4.8	2	2.5
D. Withdrew on probation	11	8.8	8	9.9
E. Withdrew in clear after one semester	2	1.6	2	2.5
F. Withdrew before any credits were earned	5	4.0	3	3.7
G. Suspended and not returned				
(1) After one semester	23	18.4	7	8.6
(2) Two or more semesters	40	32.0	27	33.3
TOTALS:	125	100.0	81	100.0

TABLE 2

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATION FRESHMAN ENTRANTS BY YEAR AND SUCCESS STATUS

Classification	Year of Entrance 1968	1970
Successful Students	19.2%	23.5%
Categories A, C (1)	2.4	7.4
TOTALS	21.6%	30.9%
Unsuccessful Students	4.8%	2.5%
Categories C (2), D, E, F, G (1), G (2)	8.8	9.9
	1.6	2.5
	4.0	3.7
	18.4	8.6
	32.0	33.3
TOTALS	69.6%	60.5%
Verdict Still Out	8.8%	8.6%
Category B		

Tables 3 and 4 were prepared in order to make similar comparison between 1968 and 1970 non-probation freshman women entrants concerning academic performance. In Table 3 we can see that 58.1% of the 1968 entrants were still in school and in the clear after four semesters, compared to 60.0% of the 1970 entrants. A greater proportion of the 1970 entrants had withdrawn while in the clear, and a somewhat lower proportion had been suspended.

Table 4 shows 71.2% of the 1968 entrants rated as "successful" compared to 74.6% of the 1970 entrants. Of the 1968 entrants, 22.4% were rated "unsuccessful", compared to 21.0% of the 1970 entrants. The proportions are so nearly similar that we must consider them explainable by chance.

In summary of all findings of Part III, the freshman hours regulations for probation entrants may have had a slightly favorable effect on students entering on probation. The performance of non-probation freshmen women after the hours were dropped in 1970 appears to be quite similar to performance when hours regulations were in effect for women.

TABLE 3

STATUS OF ENTERING FRESHMAN WOMEN AFTER FOUR SEMESTERS:
SELECTED YEARS: ENTERED NON-PROBATION

Status	Entered 1968 No.	Entered 1968 Per Cent	Entered 1970 No.	Entered 1970 Per Cent
A. In clear and in school at end of four semesters	502*	58.1	577**	60.0
After suspension: 3				
After probation: 26				
B. In school, on probation at end of four semesters	55	6.4	42	4.4
C. Withdrew in clear after two or more semesters				
(1) GPR 2.00 or better	113	13.1	140	14.6
(2) GPR below 2.00	25	2.9	13	1.4
D. Withdrew on probation	35	4.0	54	5.6
E. Withdrew in the clear after one semester	26	3.0	45	4.7
F. Withdrew before any credits were earned	21	2.4	20	2.1
G. Suspended and not returned				
(1) After one semester	19	2.2	11	1.1
(2) Two or more semesters	68	7.9	59	6.1
TOTALS:	864	100.0	961	100.0

* 22 students still had GPR below 2.00

** 19 students still had GPR below 2.00

TABLE 4

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION: ENTERING FRESHMAN NON-PROBATION WOMEN BY STATUS AND YEAR OF ENTRANCE

Classification	Year of Entrance 1968	1970
Successful Students	58.1%	60.0%
Categories A, C (1)	13.1	14.6
TOTALS	71.2%	74.6%
Unsuccessful Students	2.9%	1.4%
Categories C (2), D, E, F, G (1), G (2)	4.0	5.6
	3.0	4.7
	2.4	2.1
	2.2	1.1
	7.9	6.1
TOTALS	22.4%	21.0%
Verdict Still Out		
Category B	6.4%	4.4%

INVESTIGATOR'S CONCLUSIONS

It has already been demonstrated that there was little difference in academic performance of non-probation women for the first four semesters when they entered with no hours regulations. For students entering on probation (nearly all men) there appeared to be a slightly favorable effect of the hours regulations, since nearly ten per cent more were successful from the 1970 group than from the 1968 group. Since chance sampling might explain this difference, the investigator obtained similar data (partly shown in Part I of this report) for the 105 probation freshmen who entered in the fall of 1971. Their success categories are summarized in Table 5. When these students are classified as "successful" or "unsuccessful" as in Table 6, we find that 30.5% are considered successful, 61.9% unsuccessful, and 7.6% whose success or failure is not yet clear. But these proportions are very similar to those for probation freshmen who entered in 1968 before the freshman hours program was instituted. So if the program helped improve academic performance of probation students, it was effective only in 1970-71, the year it was instituted.

TABLE 5

ACADEMIC STATUS: ENTERING PROBATION FRESHMEN, 1971, AFTER FOUR SEMESTERS

Status	No.	Per Cent
A. In the clear and in school after four semesters	23	21.9
B. In school, on probation after four semesters	8	7.6
C. Withdrew in the clear after two or more semesters		
(1) GPR 2.00 or better	9	8.6
(2) GPR below 2.00	1	1.0
D. Withdrew while on probation	11	10.5
E. Suspended and not returned		
(1) After one semester	19	18.1
(2) After two or more semesters	27	25.7
F. Withdrew before credits were earned	3	2.8
G. Withdrew in the clear after one semester	4	3.8
TOTALS:	105	100.0

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATION FRESHMAN ENTRANTS BY SUCCESS STATUS
1971-72

Success Category	Per Cent
Successful Students	21.9
Categories A, C (1)	8.6
TOTALS	30.5%
Unsuccessful Students	
Categories C (2), D, E (1), E (2), F, G	1.0
	10.5
	18.1
	25.7
	2.8
	3.8
TOTALS	61.9%
Verdict Still Out	
Category B	7.6%